United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,079	04/12/2004	Allen Berger JR.	240061	2185
7590 09/25/2007 Sanchelima and Associates, P.A. Jesus Sanchelima, Esq.			EXAMINER JOHNSON, BLAIR M	
Wilaini, i E 331	J+		3634	
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/822,079	BERGER, ALLEN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Blair M. Johnson	3634
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR FWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL! - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re ion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON' y statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. Poply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	This action is non-final. Illowance except for formal matte	
Disposition of Claims		·
4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	thdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Extended The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the angle of the oath or declaration is objected to by the second Theorem Theorem 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the second Theorem 11.	accepted or b) objected to be to the drawing(s) be held in abeyand correction is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
1.2) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in Ape priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) I)		ummary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	48) Paper No(s)/Mail Date formal Patent Application

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, "open reinforcing members" are recited in the preamble of this Jepson form claim, indicating that such is known prior art. However, in the body of the claim, "unitary reinforcement members" are recited. It is unclear if these are the same reinforcement members as mentioned in the preamble.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Leist et al.

See Figs. 3 and 4. See reinforcements 38. The complementing joints are considered the entire upper and lower edges, in which elements 38 are located, and which have "folded" portions in the form of ribs that engage the elements 38. Each element 38 further has five sides. The joints may be broadly considered to be "tongue and groove" and "shiplap".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 3634

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger, Jr. in view of Leist et al.

See Fig. 5 in Berger where he shows continuous reinforcement members 40',41', which are described in column 4, lines 8-11, that are located in the same location on the panels as presently disclosed. What is not shown is the location of the members 40',41' under the folded edge portions. However, placing these members in such a confining location is taught by Leist et al who shows ribs that firmly locate the reinforcing members in the panels edges. In view of this teaching, it would have been obvious to modify Berger whereby his reinforcing members are located under the folded edges of the panels for such positive positioning. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Leist et al or Berger, Jr. in view of Leist et al, as applied above, and further in view of Clark.

Clark discloses edges of panels that fit Applicant's definition of "shiplap". It would have been obvious to modify either Leist et al or Burger, Jr. to have such an edge so as to provide a different seal.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues only one of the art rejections, namely the 102 rejection using Leist et

Art Unit: 3634

al. The remaining rejections have not been addressed. He alleges that the reinforcement members are not continuous and the joints are not "folded". However, the reinforcement members in Leist et al are telescopingly connected to form a "unitary" reinforcement. Regarding the "folded" joints, the term "folded" indicates a manner in which the device is "bent" or shaped and not the actual structure, which would be defined as at least two surfaces that are at an angle to each other. The portions of Leist et al that support the reinforcement member define such angled surfaces.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blair M. Johnson whose telephone number is (571) 272-6830. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Glessner can be reached on (571) 272-6843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Blair M. Johnson Priman, Evamine

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3634

BMJ 9/19/07